1	Defendant SLS did not file any such request in advance, and yet asserts an entitlement to an over-
2	length brief regardless.
3	To be clear, this is not a form-over-function objection; Plaintiff and her counsel have taken
4	care to respect this Court's rules, and may have made different strategic choices if she were
5	unconstrained by compliance with court rules. Defendant SLS is represented by counsel and was
6	capable of filing a motion for over-length brief, or asking permission from opposing counsel, but
7	it chose to do neither. Finally, SLS does not assert that its over-length brief was an oversight or
8	mistake, which – arguably – would present a different issue.
9	Plaintiff is mindful that this objection may nevertheless appear to be of little consequence
10	and apologizes to the Court for the additional filing.
11	Plaintiff respectfully objects to the portions of Defendant SLS' submissions which are
12	contrary to Local Civil Rule 7.
13	
14	Dated this 21st day of April, 2021.
15	
16	ANDERSON SANTIAGO, PLLC
17	By: /s/ Jason D. Anderson Jason D. Anderson, WSBA No. 38014
18	T. Tyler Santiago, WSBA No. 46004 Attorneys for Plaintiff
19	787 Maynard Ave. S. Seattle, WA 98104
20	(206) 395-2665 (206) 395-2719 (fax)
21	(200) 373 2717 (lux)
22	
23	